

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9 and 10 have been examined and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 4, 7 and 8 are withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,516,451 to Takeshita et al. (“Takeshita”) (assigned to Bridgestone Tire Company Limited) and U.S. Patent No. 6,230,603 to Kubala (“Kubala”)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takeshita in view of Kubala.

A. Claim 1

The features of claim 9 (and intervening claim 3) have been incorporated into claim 1. Since claim 9 is additionally rejected in view of the Kurita reference, such reference is discussed below.

In view of the amendment, claim 1 now recites, “wherein the surface of the thin blade is coated with a low-friction material whose frictional resistance is less than that of the metal configuring the thin blade” and “wherein the low-friction material is fluoro-resin.”

On page 4 of the Office Action, with regard to claim 9, the Examiner maintains that Kurita discloses coating a blade with a low friction material such as fluoro-resin for making smooth cuts. The Abstract of Kurita discloses that a surface hardening layer 3 is formed on the blade 2. However, there is no disclosure that such layer is a *low-friction* material. Furthermore, in paragraph [0007], Kurita discloses fluoro-resin. However, the cited portion of Kurita indicates

that the fluoro-resin is only applied to split-face portion 5 of the saw and not the cutting part 1. In other words, Kurita teaches that fluoro-resin is not applied to the cutting part 1.

At least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

B. Claims 5 and 6

Applicant submits that claims 5 and 6 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1.

C. Claim 10

Since claim 10 recites features that are analogous to the features discussed above for claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 10 is patentable for at least analogous reasons as claim 1.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Takeshita, Kubala and U.S. Patent No. 5,429,163 to Frenkel (“Frenkel”)

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Takeshita, Kubala and Frenkel. Since claim 2 is dependent upon claim 1, and Frenkel fails to cure the deficient teachings of Takeshita and Kubala, Applicant submits that claim 2 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Takeshita, Kubala and U.S. Patent No. 4,922,774 to Oldeman (“Oldeman”)

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takeshita in view of Kubala and Oldeman. As set forth above, the features of claim 3 have been incorporated into claim 1. Accordingly, claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Takeshita, Kubala and JP 11-179702 to Kurita (“Kurita”)

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takeshita, Kubala and Kurita. As set forth above, the features of claims 3 and 9 have been incorporated into claim 1. Applicant refers the Examiner to the comments presented for claim 1. In view of the amendment, claims 3 and 9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

V. Newly Added Claim

By this Amendment, Applicant has added claim 11 to provide more varied coverage of the present invention. Applicant submits that claim 11 reads on the elected invention. Furthermore, regarding the claimed blade thickness range of claim 11, Applicant submits that if the thickness of the blade is under 1.0 mm, the unvulcanized rubber member cannot be cut

smoothly and if the thickness is over 3.0 mm, it will take a long time for the blade to become heated.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Allison M. Tulino/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 22, 2010

Allison M. Tulino
Registration No. 48,294